III. REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. By the amendment, claims 1, 8 and 14 have been amended. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for claimed subject matter. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement and the written description requirement.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION AND REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-21 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

The Office has asserted that claims 1-21 fail to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office argues that the limitation "decoding in a single iteration through a set of frames" is not sufficiently described in the specification. In doing so, the Examiner cites one definition in the dictionary Merriamwebster.com that ties iteration to computer processes. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the other two definitions merely define the term as being directed to repeating the same operation, with a single iteration being one execution of the series of operations, without involving computer software. However, in an attempt to further prosecution, Applicants have amended the claims to replace iteration with traversal.

Applicants continue to assert that the concept is supported, *inter alia*, in paragraphs 0033-0038 of the original specification, which describe normal playback mode and operations deviating from normal playback mode that are performed by the invention to provide enhanced trick mode playback. In para. 0033 and accompanying Fig. 5, the specification recites that "...the pointers change with successive frames to prevent a frame from being decoded to a particular buffer and overwriting a previously decoded frame that has yet to be read out (e.g., displayed)." To this extent, the specification first establishes that in normal mode playback frames are read out for decoding in succession, i.e., one at a time. Turning now to para. 0037, the specification describes the enhanced trick mode play of the claimed invention, stating that "...unlike during normal playback mode, current pointer 154 and past pointer 156 are 'locked' to particular buffers." To this extent, while the enhanced trick mode play still decodes in succession, progressing through the set of frames frame by frame, it writes the frames to different buffers than in normal playback mode. As such, the progression through the set of frames for decoding purposes is still performed in sequence, i.e., in a single traversal through the set of frames.

Continuing to the first sentence of para. 0038, the specification states:

> As the frames are decoded, they will be read out in order from their corresponding buffers according to display synchronization signal 162. So that the proper display order is maintained, the controller microcode will also synchronize the display pointer (not shown) to the current pointer address.

To this extent, the reading out for display does not require a traversal through the set of frames that is in addition to the decoding pass, but rather, the reading out for display is performed "As the frames are decoded." As such, the combination of the description of the frame by frame decoding of paras. 0034 and 0037 and the reading out for display as the frames are being decoded

would make it clear to one skilled in the art, *inter alia*, that the frames that are decoded by the alternating decoding performed in a single traversal through the set of frames of the claimed invention are in condition for display, and are displayed during that single traversal. Thus, no further decoding traversals through the set of frames are necessary. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office further objects to the use of the word microcode in claim 8 of the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that wikipedia.org includes a definition of the term, stating that:

> Microcode is a layer of hardware-level instructions and/or data structures involved in the implementation of higher level machine code instructions in many computers and other processors; it resides in a special high-speed memory and translates machine instructions into sequences of detailed circuit-level operations.

To this extent, the definition of microcode commonly known to those skilled in the art is entirely consistent with the use thereof in the claimed invention because the claimed invention claims microcode used to control a processor, i.e., an MPEG-2 decoder. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hunter E. Webb/

Date: August 13, 2010

Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)